



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

S.R.

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/621,600 07/21/00 BUCHMAN

J 08485

┌

QM32/0208

THOMAS R. TREMPUS ESQUIRE ALCOA INC.
ALCOA TECHICAL CENTER
100 TECHNICAL DRIVE
ALCOA CENTER PA 15069-0001

└

EXAMINER

PASCUA, J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3727

DATE MAILED:

02/08/01

#3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/621,600

Applicant(s)

Buchman

Examiner

Jes F. Pascua

Group Art Unit

3727



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jul 21, 2000

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire three month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application

Of the above, claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration

☒ Claim(s) none is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.

☐ Claims are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number)

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received:

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 3727

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 7-9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 7, the location of the “area of weakness” has not been positively defined.

In claim 16, the specific method step performed by the terms “providing” or “forming” have not been defined, thus rendering the scope of the claim indeterminable. For the purposes of examination, the claim will be treated as a product-by-process.

Claims not specifically mentioned are rejected since they depend from claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Art Unit: 3727

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1 and 4-16 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-17 of copending Application No. 09/621,598. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: a flexible, reclosable package comprising first and second panels section, a zipper closure, a slider device mounted on the zipper closure and a tamper-evident structure encasing at least a portion of the zipper closure. As a note, Application No. 09/621,598 discloses that wall edge 33a may be discontinuous or spot sealed. The spot sealing of wall edge 33a is considered to form an abutment to the same degree as claimed in the present application.

Art Unit: 3727

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

5. Claims 1-16 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-19 of copending Application No. 09/621,598 in view of Tilman '721. Application No. 09/621,598 discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except that Application No. 09/621,598 does not show a second tamper evident-structure between the zipper closure and interior of the package. Tilman '721 teaches that it is known provide a second tamper evident-structure between the zipper closure and interior of an analogous package. See Fig. 6. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the package of Application No. 09/621,598 with the second tamper evident-structure of Tilman '721 in order to provide additional means for visually ascertaining whether or not the package has been surreptitiously opened.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Conclusion


6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3727

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Jes F. Pascua whose telephone number is (703) 308-1153.

In order to reduce pendency and avoid potential delays, Group 3720 is encouraging the FAXing of responses to Office Actions directly into the Group at (703) 305-3579. This practice may be used for filing papers not requiring a fee. It may also be used for filing papers which require a fee by applicants who authorize charges to a PTO deposit account. Please identify the Examiner and art unit at the top of your cover sheet. Papers submitted via FAX into Group 3720 will be promptly forwarded to the Examiner.

If in receiving this Office Action it is apparent to applicant that certain documents are missing, e.g., copies of references cited, form PTO-1449, form PTO-892, etc., requests for copies of such papers should be directed to Errica Bembry at (703) 306-4005.



Jes F. Pascua
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3727
February 7, 2001